

REMARKS

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-5 as follows: Claims 3-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, in regard to whether the term “the posture and position control command” is referring to “a first posture and position control command” or “a second posture and position control command”; and Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,838,250 (Maekawa) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,400,903 (Conoval).

Claims 1 and 3 have been amended. Claim 4 has been cancelled, and Claim 5 has been amended to update its dependency. Claims 1-3 and 5 are now pending in the application. No new subject matter has been introduced by these amendments.

Claims 1 and 3, which are the pending independent claims, were rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Maekawa and Conoval.

Maekawa discloses a video camera “which, in addition to being used as a video telephone set to take an image of a user, is used as a monitor camera during a remote operation” (Col. 3, lines 34-37). Maekawa teaches that its remote controlled apparatus has a “video camera 12 and...light emitting element 26...formed as one unit” (Col. 4, lines 8-9).

The Examiner admitted that Maekawa fails to teach that “the mobile communication terminal [is] detachably mounted on the dynamic support for controlling a posture of the mounted mobile communication terminal...” (Office Action, page 2) and cited Conoval as allegedly curing this defect. Conoval discloses an enclosure that detachably connects to a remote digital camera and that includes relay controller electronics and a modem for wirelessly receiving a command for actuating pan and tilt orientation of a remote digital camera.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the recitation of *an absolute coordinate value* that is included in the posture and position control command *to set the positional movement or rotation of the mounted mobile communication terminal or of the dynamic support*. Using the absolute coordinate value avoids inconvenience to the user caused by having to continuously press a key until the camera unit achieves the desired rotation position (See page 14, lines 13-24 of the Specification). Maekawa and Conoval, as well as the other cited references, fail to disclose or suggest such recitation.

Claim 3 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 4 and to include the recitation of *the first and second dynamic supports wirelessly communicate using respective Bluetooth™ modules*, which the combination of Maekawa and Conoval fails to disclose or suggest. None of the other cited references cure this defect.

Further, the amendment to Claim 3 is believed to overcome the rejection made under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Accordingly, Claims 1 and 3 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of the dependent claims, Claims 2 and 5 are believed to be in condition for allowance, at least for the above reasons.

All of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-3 and 5 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516